



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/562,814

12/27/2005

Nobuhisa Miyake

1806.1011

6487

21171 7590 05/12/2009
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BOYKIN, TERRESSA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/12/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/562,814	Applicant(s) MIYAKE ET AL.	
	Examiner Terressa M. Boykin	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 and 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34, 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

* Note that all responses to this action should be sent to Art Unit 1796 .

Drawings

A brief description of drawings is unable to be located in the specification. Please provide the page and line that the Brief Description of Drawings are headed/located.

Drawings

This application has been filed with drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-34, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recited "separating...performing and reacting" are considered indefinite with regard to the method steps since each is not sufficiently not supported by further recitations in the claim(s) of sufficient structure to accomplish the function. Note pages 24-40 of applicants' specification which more precisely defines the reaction process(es). Use of such language and parameters and limitation is suggestion. Nevertheless, if applicants choose not to use such language, the claim will remain indefinite since a process should at least recite all positive, active step and any process parameters necessitated by the specification so that the claim will "clearly set out and circumscribe a particular area with a reasonable degree of

Art Unit: 1796

precision and particularity, *In re Moore*, 169 USPQ 236, and make it clear what subject matter the claim encompasses, as well as make clear the subject matter from others would be precluded. *In re Hammack* 166 USPQ 204.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-34,38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the process steps, parameters and limitations (ranges, temperatures, amounts etc.) , does not reasonably provide enablement for any type of 'reacting' processes. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make any use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. It is noted that in each of applicants working examples, the parameters including amounts and reaction conditions are set forth within the parameters as defined by the specification on pages 30-40. However, limitations may not be read into the claims.

Although the CCPA has criticized the use of the characterization "too broad" or "undue breadth"....however, an application whose claim(s) are of a breadth which are not adequately supported by its specification is in violation of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. *In re Borkowski et al.*, (CCPA 1970) 424 F2d 904; *In re Wakefield*, (CCPA 1970) 422 F2d 897; *In re Hammack*, (CCPA 1970) 427 F2d 1378.

Case law holds that applicant's specification must be "commensurately enabling [regarding the scope of the claims]." See *Ex Parte Kung*, 17 USPQ2d 1545, 1547 (Bd. Pat. Appl. Inter. 1990). Otherwise **undue experimentation** would be involved in determining how to practice and use applicant's invention. The test for undue experimentation as to whether or not all compounds within the scope of claims 1-34,38 can be used as claimed and whether claims 1-34,38 meet the test is stated in *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546, 547 (Bd. Pat. Appl. Inter. 1986) and *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Upon applying this test to claims 1-34,38 it is believed that undue experimentation **would** be required because:

(a) *The quantity of experimentation necessary* is **great** since claims 1-34, 38 read on any type of method such as broadly claimed.

Art Unit: 1796

In light of the above factors, it is seen that undue experimentation would be necessary to make and use the invention of claims 1-34, 38 .

Information Disclosure Statement

Note that any future and/or present information disclosure statements must comply with 37 CFR § 1.98(b), which requires a list of the publications to include: the author (if any), title, relevant pages of the publication, date and place of publication to be submitted for consideration by the Office.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terressa M. Boykin whose telephone number is 571 272-1069. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday- Friday 9:30-6:00 (work at home).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571 272-1078.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Terressa M. Boykin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796